

## 4.0 SCOPING COMMENTS

The 5400 South team will continue to gather public comments about the project throughout the study via the website, comment line and project email. All comments received during the public scoping period from January 17, 2011 through February 4, 2011 are included in Appendix D: Scoping Comments.

Each comment was categorized according to the following topics: purpose and need, alternatives, design features, ancillary features, traffic operations, community impacts, air quality, noise, traffic impacts, visual quality, economic impacts, hazardous materials, indirect impacts, cyclists and pedestrians. A single comment may have included several topics. Comments are numbered in the order they were received with an “S” at the beginning for comments received during the scoping period.

### 4.1 SCOPING COMMENTS SUMMARY

UDOT received 122 comments during the scoping process. The majority (111) of comments were from individuals. Businesses contributed seven comments, non-government organizations (a church and a utility service) contributed three and one comment was contributed by a government agency.

### TOPICS OF COMMENTS

The written comment form provided at the scoping meeting (see Appendix C, Figure 4) suggested four topic areas for comments, in addition to asking for any other concerns that UDOT should consider during the study.

The first question on the comment form read, “We want to gather as much public input as possible to best understand your needs and concerns. What most interested you in coming to this meeting?” By understanding why people attended the meeting, UDOT’s public involvement team could better plan future communication with the public.

- 39% of people who responded came to the meeting to give input
- 36% came because of concerns about impacts
- 25% came to get more information

The second topic was “Why Improve 5400 South,” which was geared to responses about the actual roadway, its condition and operations.

- The most common issue mentioned was pedestrian safety/sidewalks (24% of responses)
- Access to community resources such as schools, the library, businesses and churches was the second most mentioned (11%)
- Intersection congestion was tied for third with the desire for bike lanes (9% each)
- Safety in general was the fifth most common response (8%)

The third topic, “Community Impacts,” asked the public to suggest potential impacts to the community that UDOT should consider.

- The most common response was concern about loss of homes and businesses (47% of responses)
- The second greatest concern is about impacts to people and concern that there will be a fair process for property acquisition (29%)
- Community vitality was the third most common concern (24%), with attention to maintaining community cohesion, a healthy base of businesses and protecting specific resources (fire station, churches, memorial)

The fourth topic, “Improvement Considerations,” was geared to feedback on potential solutions such as widening the roadway, improving intersections and improving shoulders and sidewalks. Under this category, the public was also asked to share other improvement options that UDOT should consider, and any other concerns that UDOT should consider during the study.

- 55% of responders liked the things they saw, including widening, shoulder and sidewalk improvements and improved traffic flow
- 45% were more concerned with impacts to businesses and properties than with the potential improvements

## SUMMARY OF COMMENTS BY TOPIC

Information gathered from the scoping comments provided the project team with a better understanding of the project area, what was important to the community and the attitudes and perceptions regarding a roadway project. From the scoping comments, the project team was able to identify the following themes:

### *Property Acquisition*

- Residents want to receive a fair price for their homes.
- Residents are very concerned about elderly, long-term residents and those with financial situations that won’t allow them to get into a new home.

### *Alternatives/Design*

- Participants believe improvements to intersections and signal timing will reduce congestion.
- Participants identify a need for improved capacity such as shoulders along the road to keep snow and garbage cans off of the sidewalks.
- Participants suggested UDOT widen alternative streets such as 4700 South.
- Participants identified a need to improve drainage along the roadway, particularly at intersections of 4015 West, 4240 West and 4270 West

*Pedestrians and Cyclists:*

- Participants definitely perceive a need to improve sidewalks for pedestrian safety.
- Participants identify a need for pedestrian access across 5400 South particularly to the schools and library.
- Participants would like bike lanes added along the roadway.
- Participants identified a need to improve left turns at 4800 West/Cougar Lane.

*Community Impacts:*

- Participants want to maintain community vitality, cohesiveness and resources.
- Participants are concerned about keeping businesses in Kearns.
- Participants are concerned about the impact widening would have on property values and businesses.

**CONTENT ANALYSIS METHOD**

UDOT received public comments through the project website ([www.udot.utah.gov/5400south](http://www.udot.utah.gov/5400south)), a project hotline (855-540-0740), a project email account ([5400south@utah.gov](mailto:5400south@utah.gov)) and in written form (i.e. comment forms provided at the public open house).

Comments were recorded into a database (see Appendix D, Figure 1) and comments were numbered and categorized.

The table in Section 4.2 lists the categories into which public comments have been sorted. Comments that correspond with each category are listed by identification numbers that were assigned by the study team. Many comments correspond to more than one category. Comments can be read in their entirety in Appendix D, Figure 1.

## CONTENT CATEGORY DEFINITIONS

PURPOSE AND NEED	The comment mentions something relevant to the purpose and need for the project, such as traffic flow, intersection congestion, shoulders and sidewalks, or safety.
ALTERNATIVES	The comment mentions options for improvements to the roadway, such as, “Consider 4700 South instead” or “Widen to seven lanes from x to y.”
DESIGN FEATURES	The comment mentions features that are typical to a roadway design: width of sidewalks and shoulders, suggestions for turn lanes and signals, drainage in a particular area, etc.
ANCILLARY FEATURES	The comment mentions important features that are often designed with a roadway but are not the primary features of its function; such as lighting or bike lanes.
TRAFFIC OPERATIONS	The comment discusses how traffic flows, where it bottlenecks, how an intersection functions, or other ways that traffic is currently operating in the area.
COMMUNITY IMPACTS	The comment outlines concerns about potential impacts of a project to the natural environment, the built environment, or to the community and its people.
AIR QUALITY	The comment refers to air quality.
NOISE	The comment refers to traffic noise.
TRAFFIC IMPACTS	The comment refers to future traffic operations; such as, impeded or improved flow of traffic if improvements are made, or impacts to traffic during construction.
VISUAL QUALITY	The comment mentions the current or future visual quality or aesthetics of the streetscape.
ECONOMIC IMPACTS	The comment mentions impacts to businesses or the economic vitality of the community.
INDIRECT IMPACTS	The comment mentions potential for an impact that does not fit the categories listed above.

## 4.2 SCOPING COMMENT CATEGORIES (TABLE)

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	COMMENT NUMBERS
Purpose and Need	37	S002, S004, S005, S006, S007, S008, S009, S010, S011, S015, S016, S019, S019, S020, S023, S024, S026, S029, S030, S031, S036, S039, S040, S046, S047, S056, S058, S069, S080, S081, S082, S096, S097, S103, S107, S117, S119, S120
Alternatives	49	S005, S006, S008, S014, S015, S019, S021, S022, S024, S027, S030, S032, S033, S036, S037, S041, S043, S044, S045, S048, S049, S051, S052, S053, S056, S058, S060, S065, S067, S068, S075, S076, S078, S083, S084, S086, S089, S093, S094, S098, S101, S102, S105, S109, S112, S113, S114, S115, S117
Design Features	48	S004, S007, S008, S009, S010, S011, S015, S018, S019, S020, S024, S028, S029, S030, S031, S034, S036, S038, S040, S044, S045, S046, S052, S056, S057, S062, S066, S073, S076, S077, S085, S086, S092, S094, S097, S101, S102, S103, S105, S107, S108, S109, S111, S113, S115, S116, S118, S120
Ancillary Features	25	S106, S001, S002, S004, S006, S008, S012, S013, S020, S024, S026, S027, S029, S036, S038, S039, S042, S056, S059, S092, S098, S103, S105, S107, S111
Traffic Operations	30	S002, S004, S006, S015, S016, S019, S020, S031, S040, S044, S053, S056, S058, S063, S070, S080, S082, S087, S088, S091, S092, S096, S103, S107, S109, S110, S112, S114, S117, S118

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	COMMENT NUMBERS
Community Impacts	70	S001, S003, S004, S005, S006, S007, S008, S009, S010, S011, S013, S015, S016, S017, S018, S019, S020, S022, S024, S029, S030, S031, S036, S038, S039, S040, S042, S043, S044, S046, S047, S048, S051, S052, S055, S056, S060, S061, S071, S072, S074, S075, S078, S081, S086, S090, S091, S092, S094, S095, S096, S097, S098, S099, S100, S101, S102, S103, S105, S106, S107, S109, S111, S112, S113, S114, S115, S117, S118, S120
Air Quality	2	S027, S054
Noise	2	S009, S039
Traffic Impacts	9	S106, S102, S020, S023, S030, S056, S058, S103, S107
Visual Quality	3	S056, S110, S117
Economic Impacts	26	S010, S011, S012, S019, S022, S029, S030, S035, S043, S049, S052, S053, S060, S061, S067, S068, S079, S094, S098, S101, S102, S106, S107, S113, S114, S117
Indirect Impacts	3	S092, S121, S122
Cyclists	14	S002, S006, S012, S013, S026, S027, S029, S059, S085, S103, S104, S106, S109, S111
Pedestrians	31	S001, S002, S008, S009, S010, S013, S018, S020, S024, S026, S029, S031, S036, S038, S040, S042, S045, S056, S057, S058, S062, S071, S077, S081, S085, S086, S091, S096, S108, S111, S112